

02-277

RECEIVED

**From:** tazo.tazo  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:13 PM  
**Subject:** Thank you

SUNSHINE PERIOD JUN 17 2003

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I just wanted to thank you very much for your upstanding and courageous attempt to prevent the FCC from changing the ruling to suit Big Business, their stinking money and more monopolies. Your actions are admirable and greatly appreciated. It is good to know someone is listening to the "little guy".

Sincerely,

Janet Rigoli

**From:** Letsrope99@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:07 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Rule Changes

Dear Ms. Kathleen Abernathy,

Please do not allow the proposed FCC Changes that would relax rules regarding monopoly ownership of media sources.

Thank you,  
Jenny Kuenzli  
letsrope99@aol.com

**From:** MGtrumpet@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:09 PM  
**Subject:** Vote

I am strongly urging you to not increase the amount of stations that can be held by one company in local markets.

Mario Guarnen  
101 Woodland Rd.  
Fairfax, CA. 94930

**From:** S. Skoropat  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:12 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

S. Skoropat (skonuff@yahoo.com) writes:

Mr. Adelstein:

I am opposed to the proposition you are planning. You must serve the public's interests, not those of private donors. And think, is this really going to help music or continue turning it into big business? Making Clear Channel bigger is a mistake. Look at what they have done so far. They have a monopoly on live entertainment and control the airwaves. They have about killed the artform of playing and producing good honest music. DO WHAT IS RIGHT AND DON'T PROMOTE A PRIVATE AGENDA.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.35.197.5  
Remote IP address: 68.35.197.5

**From:** helena sanfilippo  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:30 PM  
**Subject:** Media deregulation

Dear Sirs and Madam:

As a concerned citizen I am urging you to reconsider your stance on media deregulation. With deregulation, eventually the four major TV networks could be owned by the same company. For people without cable TV, this would be a disaster. Not everyone can afford to get cable or satellite TV. The government needs to protect everyone, not just the rich.

Ask yourself: Who will benefit most by these changes? Media conglomerates can be the only answer. The government must represent the public interest, with the widest possible range of views, as in FREE SPEECH! Besides, airwaves are public domain. It is your responsibility to keep the public domain from falling into the hands of a select few.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter essential to our freedoms.

Signed,  
One of the citizens you are sworn to serve,  
Helena Sanfilippo  
3250 19th Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94132

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).  
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

**From:** Matt Jones  
**To:** Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:37 PM  
**Subject:** Don't do it!

Don't do it. Don't deregulate the communications industry. Your job is to serve the public interest, not a select few conglomerates. The earlier deregulation brought us the five bland radio conglomerates and less competition. Are you for competition or oligarchies? Don't do it!!!!

**From:** Jerry Meyers  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:46 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Comissioner Abernathy , please vote against changing the current Broadcast rules.We dont need less controlling more.

Thank You Jerry Meyers

**From:** Bernard J. Finkle  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:47 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Bernard J. Finkle (bernafnk@aol.com) writes:

I depend on alternative sources of information to know what goes on both at home and in the world. When there are fewer independent newspapers, radio and TV sources available, that dries up my valuable independent information.

Please do not allow a few large media owners to dry up my sources of information access -- which the FCC is about to consider. (Many of these monopolistic big business media have not even reported the coming FCC agenda!! -- I wonder why!!)

Sincerely, Mrs. Shirley Lens, 6216 Estates Drive, Oakland CA 94611Dear Commissioner:

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 152.163.252.198  
Remote IP address: 152.163.252.198

**From:** vicki audette  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:49 PM  
**Subject:** no to media bill

i am totally opposed to the media bill under vote tomorrow. please vote no. vicki audette

**From:** Russell A. Huffman, Jr.  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:52 PM  
**Subject:** "A De-Regulation is hard to Re-Regulate!"

Dear FCC Commissioners:

I am writing to register my **STRONG OPPOSITION** to the FCC's motion to dismantle the current regulations on media ownership. If the proposal passes it will concentrate almost all media outlets into the hands of a few monopolistic conglomerates. The lack of diversity in ownership will homogenize programming and gravely narrow the scope of editorial content. The citizens of this nation will have fewer sources than ever before for balanced perspectives on the news.

I passionately urge you to keep the current regulations in place - or take more Time to know the impact of what you are about to DO! By doing so you will help preserve the kind of accessible freedom of speech that is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Sincerely,  
Russell A. Huffman, Jr., M.D.  
E-mail: rhuffman@knowell.com

This message, including any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the named recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of this communications is expressly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy any and all copies of the original message. Thank you.

**CC:** Russell A. Huffman, Jr., M.D., Heidi J. Huffman, Karla S. Bartholomew, Will Annett

**From:** Randy Jessup  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:58 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Randy Jessup (rjessup@ix.netcom.com) writes:

Just say NO to Clear Channel.

rj

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.238.14.87  
Remote IP address: 12.238.14.87

**From:** Bob H  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:59 PM  
**Subject:** June 2nd vote

Dear Ms Abernathy:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Robert Hansen  
Hale, MI 48739

**From:** DLaw55D@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, mccopps@fcc.gov  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:05 PM  
**Subject:** Meeting on changing ownership rules June 2, 2003

I am registering my opinion that the current ownership rules for newspapers and broadcast media should remain the same. While profits are an important consideration, access to media outlets, free enterprise and the start-up ability should also be valued and considered in the debate and voting.

Limiting ownership to a few mega-corporations runs counter to how businesses grew and developed throughout American history.

Sincerely,  
Diane Lawrence

**CC:** boxer@senate.gov, feinstein@senate.gov

**From:** Portobello3201@cs.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:05 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Ownership Rules

Your consideration of a consolidation of more broadcast radio and TV stations is absolutely abhorrent. In my geographic area there has already been mergers of many independent stations. Now when you scan the dial you hear the same opinions and formats from every station on the air.

In addition, the cost of advertising for a small business is constantly rising and rapidly becoming the same for every station. Competition is nonexistent, independent thinking is passe'.

Corporate interests will be telling us what they want us to know and think. Haven't we seen enough of the greed and disregard of anyone outside the bottom line interests of corporate America?

G E Derham

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Joan Jachetta  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:13 PM  
**Subject:** STOP proposed changes to media ownership rules

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

I am outraged by the proposed FCC changes in the media ownership rules. These changes will give the big media conglomerates even more control over the media than they already have. The resulting lack of diversity in the content of TV, radio, and newspapers will have a chilling affect on democracy. Please don't cave in to the interests of big business at the expense of the public welfare.

Sincerely,

Joan Jachetta  
16750 3rd Ave NE  
Shoreline, WA 98155  
(206) 367-8101

**From:** Paula Traffas  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:15 PM  
**Subject:** FCC rules

Please consider in your vote that media conglomeration is not in the interest of the public. Local access and diverse local sources are important to the operations of local & state democracy. Now is not the time to reduce varying viewpoints and to increase monopoly.

Thanks for listening.

Paula J. Traffas  
Austin TX

**From:** Carl F. Gortzig  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:26 PM  
**Subject:** Media Concentration

Dear Commissioners,

We strongly object to the loosening of FCC regulations as proposed by Commission Chair Powell. We have read about the proposed changes widely and in depth, discussed them with knowledgeable people, listened to Chairman Powell's presentation on "Capital Report", and read numerous articles pro and con. It is clear to us that the relaxation of the rules threatens the freedom of press by offering the opportunity for concentration of media ownership among dangerously few individuals and firms.

We urge you to vote against these changes to prevent still further erosion of freedom and civil rights in this country.

Thank you.

Carl F. Gortzig, Ph.D.  
Jean L. Gortzig, M.A.  
7 Stormy View Road  
Ithaca, New York 14850

**CC:** Mike Powell, @fcc.gov

**From:** carol morrison  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:33 PM  
**Subject:** Rule change authorization

To FCC Chairman and all members:

Congress is supposed to guard against monopoly power. But this Rules change could allow our local TV stations newspaper, radio stations, and cable provider to be owned by one company. This Rules change would usher in as erea in which a few corporation control my access to news and entertainment. This concentration of ownership would be extremely destructive to our democracy.

I ask that the FCC support a diverse, competitive, media landscape which contributes to a variety of views and information being aired.

Carol Morrison  
New London, NH

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy

**From:** Kirk Palis  
**To:** mpowell@ftc.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadelste@ftc.gov  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:55 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our great Nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

**From:** M. Magee  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:55 PM  
**Subject:** June 2nd

Dear Ms Abernathy,

Please do not allow companies to own more stations. Already when I switch from channel to channel I see the same stories being reported.

Where is the quality programming the networks are talking about?

Entertainment value attracts viewers and brings in money, but I need media sources that bring me the wide world with diversity of content and viewpoint.

Create rules that guard public ownership of the airwaves, not private.

Sincerely,

Molly Magee

**From:** CyclesPS@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:57 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

DO NOT DO IT JUNE 2nd. The airwaves belong to the people and we dont want a few people controlling this.

**From:** CyclesPS@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:58 PM  
**Subject:** NO JUNE2ND

DO NOT DO IT JUNE 2nd. The airwaves belong to the people and we dont want a few people controlling this.

**From:** Jani Tollow  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell, Kathleen  
Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** No on Media Monopoly!

Don't Let The Corporate And Government Right Wing Interest Groups Control The Media! Freedom of  
Speech is a Constitutional Right!

**From:** Rocket3bsa@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rule issue

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our great Nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

**From:** Donald Hart  
**To:** Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:03 PM  
**Subject:** On your vote Monday to stifle local news coverage...

I just read an article by Associated press writer Michael Ho. He says Republican members are expected to vote according to big business interests instead of the people's interests, and the Democratic members just the opposite.

Immediately it is apparent that if this is indeed the way the vote will go, then why have a vote by you people? You might as well have President Bush, Dick Cheney, and Tom Daschle cast the votes for you. Even members of Congress are becoming (already are?) puppets of a higher agenda. I would take a guess that the Republican agenda is that more Republican/Conservative entities own the conglomerate media outlets, and therefore it is good for the party if these 'friends' controlled what the people see/hear/read no matter what means they try to get balanced reporting. On the other hand, the Democrats might think their 'friends' own more of the smaller, local stations/papers, and even if they have lost the battle for the people's heart's and mind's on the large scale, there still exists some alternative sources of information, albeit mostly local.

Haven't you noticed that many events unfavorable to the current administration are never mentioned in the major media? Are they afraid they will get calls and threats from the administration if they report anything unfavorable? I'm surprised that part of the committee's report on mistakes by Condoleezza Rice and other administration members actually made print because the administration has quickly gathered the reports and stamped them secret, even after they were made public!

This tells you right there what we can expect from a Republican-controlled media. Why did they undulate the news with Monica Lewinski for over a year instead of something important to the Nation? But, won't report anything unfavorable now? Any ideas why? Is the media controlled? Yes or No?

A big concern I hope you've thought of is a short piece I read that in North Dakota, I believe it was, Clearchannel had bought up the local radio stations, fired the employees (another downfall of conglomerate ownership,) and turned the stations into 'robot' stations controlled from a few states away. It turned out this was a small town and they had a train wreck near mid-town that spilled many tons of a toxic substance I can't now remember. The officials tried to reach someone at the radio station to make an emergency broadcast to evacuate. No one was there, it was on remote control! After an hour and 1/2, they got someone in this other state to call a caretaker employee to open the station and make the broadcast. It was too little too late however, because by then over 300 unknowing citizens were sickened and taken to their overflowing hospital.

Is this what you want to accomplish for the best interests of the people? Is politics more important than human life? What if your mother lived there? Sorry mom, I was told how to vote and I had to follow orders. I'll give you a nice burial though.

Sincerely,  
Donald Hart  
5364 Padre Lane  
Indianapolis, IN 46237-2010  
fax or voice mail: (815) 550-7019  
dobar@box.ms

**CC:** wrl@warresisters.org, woll@earthlink.net, whitley strieber,  
webmaster@progressiveaustin.org, vfp@igc.org, vatobservny@qwest.net, Truthout Issues, Truthout Forum, Truthout Comments, thetablet@thetablet.co.uk, talkback@progressive.org,

standupny@onebox.com, spangler@ogb.wfu.edu, pm@osce.org, ornet@ossrom.va, newyork@ilo.org, newspaper@anglicanmediasydney.asn.au, news@prorev.com, news@mobtown.org, News Max Com, neiltroach@aol.com, neil.anderson@union-network.org, letters@natcath.org, letters@copvcia.com, labornet@labornet.org, kevjoy@aol.com, jr@rense.com, info@icemna.org, ilwu@patriot.net, iacenter@iacenter.org, grierp@csps.com, gery@action-mail.org, editorial@war-times.org, editor@dailyfreepress.com, editor@cursor.org, edirector@collegedems.com, contact@union-network.org, bampac@bampac.org, alex@infowars.com, admin-us@aiusa.org, interactive8@wishtv.com, IndyNewsroom@indystar.com

**From:** Tlclaire@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:11 PM  
**Subject:** Re Proposed regulations

To the Chairman and Commissioners;  
As the former President of Westinghouse Television Stations (now CBS/VIACOM), as well as the former Television Chairman of the National Association of Broadcasters, I am writing to you to express my grave concern over the proposed vote on the expansion of ownership that would occur in the event of the passage of the regulations before you. There is already too much concentration of power in the hands of far too few broadcasters. It is not in the interest of the American Public to further expand the domination that is evident even now. The FCC is supposed to be serving the interest of the public. This re-regulation is detrimental to the very diversity that you should make every effort to guarantee. While it is true that cable and satellite deliver wide diversity, they do not in any way enhance the local programming options. It is a rare cable situation that delivers local news, information and public affairs programming. It is nonexistent in satellite.

I would hate to see the chosen few dominate and control the flow of information to the local markets, at the whim of the people whose political and social agenda has no chance of reflecting the local market. I believe that in the interest of YOUR integrity, you cannot allow this legislation to pass. It is evident, if the news reports are correct, there has been far too much "input" from the powerful few, and far too little from the general citizenry. Do not run roughshod over the best interest of the American People.

I sincerely hope that you will serve that public interest by defeating the proposed regulations

Thomas L. Goodgame  
President Emeritus  
Westinghouse Television Stations  
P.O. Box 24901  
Little Rock, AR 72221  
(501) 227-8441

**From:** Gregory Peterson  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:12 PM  
**Subject:** FCC ruling 6/02/03

Dear Chairman Kabernat,

I strongly disagree with the views and convictions that the consumers will be better served by allowing owners to own more media outlets.

The pro's and con's of this case have only recently been brought to the public. It is my feeling that under a less restrictive environment, this information would likely have never been made available to the general public through most if not all media outlets.

Freedom of the press is the only thing that protects our democracy. Putting the care of this vital component in the hands of a few (and a foreigner) is reckless

If the broadcast companies can not compete with their cable brethren, perhaps they need consider producing a better product. This approach seems to work in most other industries and is the backbone of most conservative agenda's.

Thank you for your time,  
Greg Peterson  
Milwaukie, OR

**From:** Msweetgin@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:12 PM  
**Subject:** The airwaves belong to the people

The public airwaves need to belong to the public. Please do not take that away. The devastation could be tremendous. America cannot receive it's news about our people and the people of the world through the filter of corporate media conglomerates. It is a cancer growth on our constitution and denies the masses the information to make educated and just and true decisions. I understand this serves a glorious purpose for the 1% of our population who need to secure their "power", but you are in a position to stop a great evil. Do not take this lightly. It is a decision that would make George Orwell a clairvoyant.

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Roxanne Bales  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:15 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Roxanne Bales (rxbus@yahoo.com) writes:

I urge you to vote against loosening restrictions on the number of broadcast outlets that a single corporate entity can own in a geographic region. Access to diversity of opinion is essential to maintain our democracy. Even with the existing rules there are insufficient checks and balances.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.236.79.162  
Remote IP address: 12.236.79.162

**From:** Dot Young  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:17 PM  
**Subject:** Stop Media Consolidation

Preserve free speech and diversity of opinion.

Please vote note on the upcoming regulation allowing additional media consolidation.

Thank you,

Dorothy Young